1		BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.
2		REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF A. WAYNE GRAY
3		BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF
4		SOUTH CAROLINA
5		DOCKET NO. 2003-326-C
6		MARCH 12, 2004
7		
8		
9	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, YOUR BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND YOUR
10		POSITION WITH BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.
11		("BELLSOUTH").
12		
13	A.	My name is A. Wayne Gray. My business address is 675 West Peachtree Street
14		Atlanta, Georgia 30375. My title is Director – Regional Planning and Engineering
15		Center in BellSouth's Network Planning and Support organization.
16		
17	Q.	ARE YOU THE SAME A. WAYNE GRAY WHO PREVIOUSLY FILED DIRECT
18		TESTIMONY IN THIS DOCKET ON JANUARY 29, 2004?
19		
20	A.	Yes.
21		
22	Q.	ARE YOU RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING THAT BELLSOUTH PROVISIONS
23		COLLOCATION ARRANGEMENTS ON A TIMELY BASIS?
24		
25	A.	Yes. I am responsible for ensuring that BellSouth provisions collocation

arrangements in the timeframes required by state commissions, including The Public Service Commission of South Carolina ("Commission"), and BellSouth's interconnection agreements.

4

3

1

2

## Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

5

Α. My testimony rebuts portions of the direct testimony of MCI witness James D. Webber and AT&T witnesses Jay M. Bradbury and Mark Van de Water. These witnesses allege that competitive carriers are "impaired" as a result of issues regarding collocation in BellSouth's central offices. Such allegations are not true. As an initial matter, the only collocation issue that the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") directed the states to consider in assessing impairment is "whether a lack of sufficient collocation space gives rise to impairment in [a] market." TRO ¶ 472. As set forth in my direct testimony, the availability of sufficient collocation space in BellSouth's South Carolina central offices is not a problem and certainly does not give rise to impairment. Notably, none of the Competitive Local Exchange Carrier ("CLEC") witnesses cite even a single instance of an alleged space availability issue. Moreover, BellSouth has consistently achieved excellent results with respect to the collocation performance measurements established by this Commission, as discussed in greater detail in the testimony of BellSouth witness Alphonso Varner.

22

23

24

25

Q. ALL PARTIES HAVE DIRECTED THIS COMMISSION TO VARIOUS

PORTIONS OF THE FCC TRIENNIAL REVIEW ORDER ("TRO") AND THE FCC

RULES IN SUPPORT OF THEIR POSITIONS IN THEIR DIRECT TESTIMONY.

1		WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF THE D.C. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ORDER
2		ON THE FCC TRO IN THIS PROCEEDING?
3		
4	A.	Currently the impact of the DC Circuit Court's opinion is unclear. At the time of
5		filing this testimony, the DC Circuit Court had vacated large portions of the rules
6		promulgated as a result of the TRO, but stayed the effective date of the opinion
7		for at least sixty (60) days. Therefore my understanding is that the TRO remains
8		intact for now, but its content, and the rules adopted thereto, must be suspect in
9		light of the court's harsh condemnation of large portions of the TRO.
10		Accordingly, I will reserve judgment, and the right to supplement my testimony as
11		circumstances dictate, with regard to the ultimate impact of the DC Circuit Court's
12		Order on this case.
13		
14	<u>Testi</u>	mony of MCI Witness James D. Webber
15	Q.	ON PAGE 10, MR. WEBBER ALLEGES THAT "WITHOUT COLLOCATION OR
16		SOME OTHER METHOD OF PHYSICALLY ACCESSING CUSTOMER LOOPS,
17		SUCH AS EELS, MCI CANNOT OFFER SERVICES TO MOST OF ITS
18		CURRENT, OR EMBEDDED, BASE OF CUSTOMERS ABSENT ACCESS TO
19		UNBUNDLED LOCAL SWITCHING. DOES BELLSOUTH CURRENTLY HAVE
20		SPACE AVAILABLE FOR COLLOCATION IN ITS SOUTH CAROLINA
21		CENTRAL OFFICES?
22		
23	A.	Yes. As I testified in my direct testimony, collocation space is currently available
24		in all of BellSouth's central offices in South Carolina. If MCI needs collocation
		in an or Benedating central emoces in Court Carolina. It wer needs conceation

1		BellSouth is committed to working closely with MCI to provide whatever
2		collocation space MCI may need to serve its mass market customers.
3		
4	Q.	IN REGARD TO ENHANCED EXTENDED LINKS ("EELS"), CAN MCI ORDER
5		EELS TODAY AND USE THESE EELS TO CONVERT ITS EMBEDDED UNE-P
6		CUSTOMER BASE TO UNE-L?
7		
8	A.	Yes. MCI can order a UNE-L and DS0 transport service as an EEL from its
9		collocation space in one central office to its collocation space in another central
10		office or to its own Point of Presence ("POP") or switch today.
11		
12	Q.	IS THE FACT THAT MCI HAS CHOSEN NOT TO COLLOCATE IN ALL OF
13		BELLSOUTH'S CENTRAL OFFICES IN SOUTH CAROLINA OR REQUEST
14		EELS TO SERVE ITS MASS MARKET CUSTOMERS RELEVANT IN THIS
15		COMMISSION'S DETERMINATION OF COLLOCATION IMPAIRMENT?
16		
17	A.	No. MCI has made a choice not to collocate in all of the BellSouth central offices
18		in South Carolina, which serve its UNE Platform ("UNE-P") customers.
19		Furthermore, it appears that MCI has not ordered any EELs to serve these same
20		customers. However, in the context of this proceeding, these facts are irrelevant.
21		MCI has had, and will continue to have, very little incentive to collocate its
22		equipment in these other central offices or request EELs from BellSouth, as long
23		as BellSouth is required to provide unbundled local switching and UNE-P.
24		

1	Q.	ON PAGE 43, MR. WEBBER ARGUES THAT BECAUSE CLECS HAVE TO
2		COLLOCATE THEY ARE "BY DEFINITION - DISADVANTAGED AND
3		THEREFORE POTENTIALLY IMPAIRED." DO YOU AGREE?
4		
5	A.	No. As I stated above, the only question regarding collocation that is relevant
6		under the impairment analysis set out by the FCC in its Triennial Review Order is
7		whether a lack of sufficient collocation space gives rise to impairment in a
8		particular market. There is no dispute that collocation space is currently
9		available in all of BellSouth's central offices in South Carolina.
10		
11	Q.	AT THE BOTTOM OF PAGE 43, MR. WEBBER INDICATES THAT MCI IS NOT
12		COLLOCATED IN ENOUGH OFFICES TO SERVE ITS UNE-P MASS MARKET
13		CUSTOMER BASE. PLEASE COMMENT.
14		
15	A.	That MCI is not currently collocated in all of the BellSouth central offices that
16		serve MCI's UNE-P mass market customers is irrelevant. Collocation space is
17		available in South Carolina and BellSouth is ready to provide whatever
18		collocation space MCI may require in South Carolina to serve its UNE-P mass
19		market customers.
20		
21	Q.	ON PAGE 44, MR. WEBBER SPECULATES, WITHOUT ANY EVIDENCE, THAT
22		IT IS "UNCLEAR WHETHER THE CLECS AS A WHOLE WILL BE ABLE TO
23		OBTAIN COLLOCATION ARRANGEMENTS IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE
24		NECESSARY TRANSPORT FACILITIES ON A TIMELY BASIS." IS HIS
25		UNSUBSTANTIATED SPECULATION CORRECT?

A. Absolutely not. Mr. Webber does not provide a single instance when MCI has been unable to obtain collocation in a timely manner. Pursuant to the Service Quality Measurement (SQM) plan this Commission adopted, BellSouth is measured every month on the time it takes to respond to all CLEC collocation applications (C-1 Measurement), the time it takes BellSouth to provision a collocation arrangement (C-2 Measurement), and the percentage of collocation provisioning interval due dates missed by BellSouth (C-3 Measurement). BellSouth's performance under the Commission's collocation measures has been uniformly superb, and BellSouth is committed to devoting the resources

## Q. HAS BELLSOUTH EVER MISSED ANY OF ITS COLLOCATION PROVISIONING INTERVALS IN SOUTH CAROLINA?

A.

No. BellSouth's goal is to complete the provisioning of collocation space as quickly as possible. Moreover, a CLEC may request permission to occupy its requested collocation space, and BellSouth will not unreasonably withhold its permission, prior to the completion of the space preparation activities being performed by BellSouth. This would enable the CLEC to install its equipment and facilities at the same time that BellSouth is completing its work activities to prepare the space in accordance with the CLEC's specifications.

necessary to continue meeting the intervals prescribed by this Commission.

Q. ON PAGE 45, MR. WEBBER SPECULATES THAT EVEN IF CLECS WERE TO OBTAIN COLLOCATION. "IT IS NOT UNCOMMON TO EXPERIENCE

1		SIGNIFICANT DELAYS BEFORE GAINING ACCESS TO THE REQUESTED
2		ARRANGEMENTS." IS HE CORRECT?
3		
4	A.	No. BellSouth is not aware of any CLEC that has been unable to access its
5		collocation arrangements pursuant to the terms and conditions contained in the
6		CLEC's interconnection agreement, and Mr. Webber cites no evidence to support
7		his assertion to the contrary.
8		
9		BellSouth does have certain security access requirements that a CLEC must
10		comply with, including certification that its employees and vendors have
11		completed security training and meet certain security requirements, in order to
12		gain access to a specific central office. However, once the CLEC has met these
13		requirements, there would be no reason for a CLEC to be denied access to the
14		central office in which its collocation arrangement is located. If the CLEC fails to
15		comply with the security requirements, then the CLEC has the right to request a
16		BellSouth Security Escort, which will be coordinated and scheduled with the
17		CLEC before the CLEC is permitted access into the requested central office.
18		
19	Test	mony of AT&T Witness Jay M. Bradbury
20	Q.	ON PAGE 8, MR. BRADBURY STATES THAT "CLEC BACKHAUL COSTS
21		INCLUDE THE NON-RECURRING COSTS NECESSARY TO ESTABLISH A
22		COLLOCATION ARRANGEMENT IN EVERY ILEC WIRE CENTER IN WHICH
23		THE CLEC WISHES TO OFFER MASS MARKET SERVICES." PLEASE
24		COMMENT.

A. Mr. Bradbury is wrong. It is not necessary for a CLEC to collocate in every central office in which it wishes to offer mass market services. The CLEC can purchase from BellSouth an enhanced extended link ("EEL"), which is the combination of a local loop and interoffice transport to a wire center where the CLEC's switch is collocated. BellSouth also offers an assembly point product, which allows CLECs to combine UNEs in a specific central office, without the necessity for the CLEC to collocate in that office.

With respect to the rates a CLEC incurs for collocation, this Commission established those rates in previous proceedings. Any complaint that AT&T may have about Commission-approved rates should be raised in the next cost proceeding and certainly does not constitute any grounds for a finding of impairment.

15 Q. AT THE BOTTOM OF PAGE 19 AND TOP OF PAGE 20, MR. BRADBURY
16 STATES THAT "THE FCC'S RULES DO NOT PERMIT A CLEC TO PLACE A
17 CIRCUIT SWITCH IN A COLLOCATION" AND THEN QUOTES FROM 47
18 C.F.R. §51.323 AS SUPPORT. IS HE CORRECT?

20 A. No. 47 C.F.R. § 51.323(b) states:

An incumbent LEC shall permit the collocation and use of any equipment necessary for interconnection or access to unbundled network elements.

The FCC goes on to clarify the above statement in subsections (b)(1) – (3) of the Rule as follows:

9

16 17 18

19

20

21

29 30

31

32

3334

35

36

37

(1) Equipment is necessary for interconnection if an inability to deploy that equipment would, as a practical, economic, or operational matter, preclude the requesting carrier from obtaining interconnection with the incumbent LEC at a level equal in quality to that which the incumbent obtains within its own network or the incumbent provides to any affiliate, subsidiary, or other party.

- (2) Equipment is necessary for access to an unbundled network element if an inability to deploy that equipment would, as a practical, economic, or operational matter, preclude the requesting carrier from obtaining nondiscriminatory access to that unbundled network element, including any of its features, functions, or capabilities.
- (3) Multi-functional equipment shall be deemed necessary for interconnection or access to an unbundled network element if and only if the primary purpose and function of the equipment, as the requesting carrier seeks to deploy it, meets either or both of the standards set forth in paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section. For a piece of equipment to be utilized primarily to obtain equal in quality interconnection or nondiscriminatory access to one or more unbundled network elements, there also must be a logical nexus between the additional functions the equipment would perform and the telecommunication services the requesting carrier seeks to provide to its customers by means of the interconnection or unbundled network element. The collocation of those functions of the equipment that, as stand-alone functions, do not meet either of the standards set forth in paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section must not cause the equipment to significantly increase the burden on the incumbent's property.
- Q. DO THE FCC'S RULES PRECLUDE A CLEC FROM PLACING A CIRCUIT SWITCH IN A COLLOCATION ARRANGEMENT?
- A. No, so long as the circuit switch is being used for the purpose(s) of interconnecting and/or accessing unbundled network elements in the provision of telecommunications services.

1		
2	Q.	DOES BELLSOUTH PERMIT CLECS TO PLACE CIRCUIT SWITCHES IN
3		COLLOCATION SPACE?
4		
5	A.	Yes, as long as the CLEC is utilizing the circuit switch <b>primarily</b> for the purposes
6		of interconnection and/or access to unbundled network elements in the provision
7		of telecommunications services to its customers.
8		
9	Q.	AT THE BOTTOM OF PAGE 23 AND TOP OF PAGE 24, MR. BRADBURY
10		APPEARS TO IMPLY THAT SUFFICIENT COLLOCATION SPACE DOES NOT
11		EXIST IN THE ILEC'S CENTRAL OFFICES. IS HIS ASSESSMENT
12		ACCURATE?
13		
14	A.	No. While BellSouth cannot speak on behalf of the other ILECs in South
15		Carolina, as I testified above, collocation space is available in every BellSouth
16		central office in South Carolina.
17		
18	Q.	ON PAGE 24, MR. BRADBURY STATES THAT "THE COLLOCATION POWER
19		CHARGES ARE DRIVEN BY THE CHARGES FOR REDUNDANT POWER
20		FEEDS (SIZED FOR THE MAXIMUM DEMAND IN THE COLLOCATION) AND
21		THE NECESSARY HVAC FOR THE COLLOCATED EQUIPMENT." IS HE
22		CORRECT?
23		
24	A.	Only partially. Mr. Bradbury is correct that the collocation power charges are
25		driven by the charges for redundant power feeds ("A and B" power cable feeds).

However, he is not correct in his statement that collocation power charges are driven by the necessary HVAC for the collocated equipment. BellSouth's DC power charges do not include any HVAC costs associated with collocation. These costs are recovered in the monthly Floor Space Charges paid by the CLECs to BellSouth, not in the DC Power charges.

7 Q. ON PAGE 25, MR. BRADBURY COMPLAINS THAT "THE AVERAGE COST OF

8 COLLOCATION . . . MAY BECOME PROHIBITIVE, BECAUSE THE

9 EQUIPMENT DEPLOYED ACTUALLY REQUIRES SUBSTANTIALLY LESS

10 SPACE AND/OR POWER THAN THE MINIMUM SPACE REQUIRED OR

11 POWER CHARGED FOR BY THE ILEC." IS HIS ASSESSMENT ACCURATE?

Α.

No. Mr. Bradbury's complaint is mere speculation and is not supported by any facts. Furthermore, in regard to Mr. Bradbury's allegation regarding minimum space requirements, BellSouth permits CLECs to request cageless collocation space in increments as small as that required for a single bay or rack of equipment. For caged collocation space, BellSouth recently reduced its minimum requirement from 100 square feet to 50 square feet. Additional increments of 50 square feet for caged collocation will continue to be allowed.

Q. FINALLY, MR. BRADBURY STATES THAT "THE INCUMBENT SOMETIMES
APPLIES LARGE UP-FRONT ONE-TIME CHARGES FOR THE COLLOCATION
APPLICATION, CAGE ENGINEERING (WHETHER FOR SPACE OR POWER)
OR ADMINISTRATIVE FEES (SUCH AS PROJECT MANAGEMENT, SPACE
AVAILABILITY REPORTS, ETC.)." IS HE CORRECT?

1 2 A. No. As an initial matter, BellSouth's collocation rates have been established by 3 this Commission. Non-recurring charges allow BellSouth to recover the one-time costs it incurs to provision collocation space for the CLEC. BellSouth's Initial 4 5 Application Fee of \$1,883.67 recovers BellSouth's nonrecurring costs associated with the CLEC's submission of an initial application or service inquiry requesting 6 7 a specific collocation arrangement. This fee includes the following work activities 8 performed by BellSouth's employees and suppliers: reviewing the initial 9 application and collocation agreement, gathering, preparing and distributing 10 BellSouth's application response to the customer, processing the application fee, 11 setting up billing account information, coordinating meetings with the appropriate 12 work groups, developing a project timeline, resolving any Network issues, reviewing power capacity requirements to ensure that adequate capacity is 13 14 available, determining the availability of duct space, researching options for the 15 point of interconnection, reviewing the facility requested, entering tracking data 16 and the associated work request(s), reviewing the application for space, power, 17 and cabling requirements, performing a site visit to verify space availability and 18 inspecting space conditions, coordinating space selection, preparation, cable and

21

22

23

24

19

20

the CLEC.

Q. DOES BELLSOUTH APPLY LARGE UP-FRONT ONE-TIME CHARGES FOR "CAGE ENGINEERING (WHETHER FOR SPACE OR POWER)" AS MR. BRADBURY ALLEGES?

power requirements, and performing a central office survey and cost estimate for

A. No. BellSouth does not assess one-time (nonrecurring) charges for the floor space associated with a caged collocation arrangement, the central office and common system modifications required to accommodate caged collocation space, or the amount of DC power requested by the CLEC. The fees to recover those costs are all billed as monthly recurring charges.

Q. WHAT DOES BELLSOUTH CHARGE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE FEES (SUCH AS
 PROJECT MANAGEMENT, SPACE AVAILABILITY REPORTS, ETC.)?

A. "Administrative fees" (such as project management fees) are included in BellSouth's Initial Application Fee (which is described above) or in the Firm Order Processing fee (\$602.05), which includes the nonrecurring costs associated with BellSouth's receipt, review, and processing of a collocation Bona Fide Firm Order. These costs include processing payments, distributing information to various work groups, scheduling meetings internally and externally, and establishing and monitoring project critical dates.

BellSouth only bills a CLEC for a Space Availability Report (\$1,077.57 per requested central office) when a CLEC requests that BellSouth prepare this report for a specific central office. The CLEC is not billed for this report until after BellSouth has provided the requested report to the CLEC. To my knowledge, AT&T has never requested a Space Availability Report for any central office in the BellSouth Region

## Testimony of AT&T Witness Mark Van de Water

Q. ON PAGE 50, MR. VAN DE WATER CITES PARAGRAPH 514 OF THE FCC
TRO AS REQUIRING BELLSOUTH TO "PROVIDE" CROSS-CONNECTIONS
BETWEEN THE FACILITIES OF TWO CLECS (emphasis in original). WHAT
ARE THE FCC'S RULES REGARDING BELLSOUTH'S OBLIGATION TO
"PROVIDE" CO-CARRIER CROSS-CONNECTIONS?

7 A. 47 C.F.R. § 51.323(b)(h) states:

 (h) As described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this section, an incumbent LEC shall permit a collocating telecommunications carrier to interconnect its network with that of another collocating telecommunications carrier at the incumbent LEC's premises and to connect its collocated equipment to the collocated equipment of another telecommunications carrier within the same premises, provided that the collocated equipment is also used for interconnection with the incumbent LEC or for access to the incumbent LEC's unbundled network elements.

(1) An incumbent LEC shall provide, at the request of a collocating telecommunications carrier, a connection between the equipment in the collocated spaces of two or more telecommunications carriers, except to the extent the incumbent LEC permits the collocating parties to provide the requested connection for themselves or a connection is not required under paragraph (h)(2) of this section. Where technically feasible, the incumbent LEC shall provide the connection using copper, dark fiber, lit fiber, or other transmission medium, as requested by the collocating telecommunications carrier. (emphasis added)

(2) An incumbent LEC is not required to provide a connection between the equipment in the collocated spaces of two or more telecommunications carriers if the connection is requested pursuant to section 201 of the Act, unless the requesting carrier submits to the incumbent LEC a certification that more than 10 percent of the amount of traffic to be transmitted through the connection will be interstate. The incumbent LEC cannot refuse to accept the certification, but instead must provision the service promptly. Any

1 incumbent LEC may file a section 208 complaint with the Commission challenging the certification if it believes that the 2 certification is deficient. No such certification is required for a 3 4 request for such connection under section 251 of the Act. 5 (emphasis added) 6 7 8 Q. DOES BELLSOUTH COMPLY WITH THE FCC'S RULES? 9 10 Yes. BellSouth permits collocated CLECs to provision the necessary Co-Carrier Α. 11 Cross Connects ("CCXCs") themselves, in compliance with 47 C.F.R. § 12 51.323(b)(h)(1). 13 Q. WHAT ABOUT THE FCC'S REQUIREMENT UNDER 47 C.F.R. §51.323 14 (b)(h)(2)? HAS BELLSOUTH FILED A SECTION 201 CCXC OFFERING IN ITS 15 TARIFF FCC NO. 1? 16 17 Yes. BellSouth recently filed its Section 201 CCXC tariff offering in BellSouth 18 Α. 19 Tariff FCC No. 1, as required by 47 C.F.R. § 51.323(b)(h)(2). In order to 20 differentiate the tariff offering, CCXCs offered pursuant to the tariff are called "Intra-Office Collocation Cross Connects" in the tariff. This tariff is in effect, so 21 22 AT&T and other CLECs can place orders pursuant to the Section 201 tariff 23 offering. However, as the FCC has stated in its rules, any CLEC that orders this product must certify that more than 10% of the traffic transmitted over this intra-24 25 office cross connection will be interstate. 26 27 Q. ON PAGES 52 - 56, MR. VAN DE WATER COMPLAINS ABOUT BELLSOUTH'S POLICY REGARDING THE USE OF MULTIPLE COMPANY CODES TO PLACE 28

ORDERS TO COLLOCATION ARRANGEMENTS	WHAT IS BELLSOUTH'S
LINDERSTANDING OF THIS ISSUE?	

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1

2

A. BellSouth understands that this issue arises due to AT&T's use of multiple company codes. AT&T is complaining that one AT&T entity cannot place orders on behalf of another AT&T entity for services that it wishes to originate or terminate to the second AT&T entity's collocation space. What has happened is that AT&T has established its collocation sites using the Access Customer Name Abbreviation ("ACNA") "ATX" (for AT&T), but is placing service requests to these sites using the ACNA "TPM" for Teleport Communications Group or "FIM" for North Point (both of which AT&T acquired). In other words, AT&T wishes to permit those entities it has acquired over the years, and which have different ACNAs, to place orders to the collocation sites that belong to the ACNA "ATX" for AT&T. When AT&T orders collocation space from BellSouth, the collocation "address" is built into the cable and pair identification records using the ACNA of the ordering CLEC. It is BellSouth's policy not to accept assignments from CLECs other than the owner of the collocation space in order to protect a CLEC's assets/property. Therefore, BellSouth's ordering and provisioning systems are designed to prevent unauthorized assignment of its customers' collocation assets.

21

Q. ON PAGE 52, MR. VAN DE WATER ARGUES THAT "BELLSOUTH'S POLICIES, PRACTICES, AND SYSTEMS EFFECTIVELY PREVENT A CLEC FROM BEING ABLE TO ORDER A LOOP FROM BELLSOUTH AND SWITCHING FROM ANOTHER CLEC." IS THIS TRUE?

A. No. BellSouth's policies, practices, and systems do not prohibit a CLEC from ordering a UNE loop from BellSouth and the switching function from another CLEC, except when the CLEC is requesting that a DS0 UNE loop be provided to another CLEC's collocation space.

7 Q. IN SUPPORT OF HIS ARGUMENT, MR. VAN DE WATER ALLEGES "IF AT&T

8 WERE TO SUBMIT A SERVICE REQUEST TO PURCHASE A LOOP FROM

9 BELLSOUTH AND DELIVER IT TO ANOTHER CLEC'S COLLOCATION,

10 BELLSOUTH'S SYSTEMS COULD NOT PROCESS THE ORDER." PLEASE

11 COMMENT.

A.

If AT&T were trying to order a UNE loop at a DS0 level to terminate to another CLEC's collocation space, BellSouth's ordering system would reject the order for manual intervention for the reasons described above, because AT&T's ACNA and the receiving CLEC's ACNA would be different. BellSouth's billing systems cannot process a LSR at the DS0 (2-wire or 4-wire) level of service for the connection of a local loop to another CLEC's collocation space, because the collocation "address" is built into the cable and pair identification records using the ACNA of the ordering CLEC. This requirement has been in place from the initial implementation of BellSouth's ordering system for all DS0 level services. If AT&T wished to place an order for transport to another CLEC's collocation space, at a DS1 or higher level of service, and the receiving carrier had provided AT&T with the appropriate terminating Connecting Facility Assignment ("CFA") and a Letter of Authorization ("LOA") indicating its permission for AT&T to

terminate its transport into the receiving CLEC's collocation space, then BellSouth could process the order through its ordering system as requested by AT&T. It should be noted that AT&T would be the party billed for the service and would be responsible for requesting the appropriate cross connection, by service type (DS1, DS3, 2-fiber, or 4-fiber). If the service requested by AT&T was for the termination of UNE transport into another CLEC's collocation space, then the associated cross-connects would be those contained in AT&T's interconnection agreement. If AT&T ordered its transport service from the tariff, then the appropriate cross-connects contained in the associated tariff would apply.

Q. IN LIGHT OF THE ORDERING SYSTEM ISSUE IDENTIFIED ABOVE, HOW

COULD A CLEC ACHIEVE ITS DESIRE TO PLACE AN ORDER FOR A DS0

LOOP FROM BELLSOUTH AND WHOLESALE SWITCHING FROM ANOTHER

CLEC?

A. The most effective means for AT&T to eliminate this problem is to use BellSouth's "Transfer of Ownership" process to convert all of its collocation sites to one common ACNA, presumably the "ATX" ACNA. This would eliminate AT&T's concern and there would be no further fall-out of AT&T's orders in BellSouth's ordering and provisioning systems resulting from the use of multiple ACNAs.

Another option would be for the ordering CLEC (in this case, AT&T) to request a DS0 loop into its collocation space and then place a co-carrier cross connection ("CCXC") between its collocation space and that of the receiving CLEC, if both

CLECs have collocation space in the same central office. This would allow the ordering CLEC and the receiving CLEC to directly exchange their traffic in the same central office, without any intervention by BellSouth.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

Finally, AT&T could use a "Guest/Host" collocation arrangement to establish a guest presence in the central office for which AT&T wished to order services. Under the "Guest/Host" arrangement, each Guest is assigned a unique Access Carrier Terminal Location ("ACTL") and specific CFAs within the caged collocation space. Using the Guest/Host scenario, for illustrative purposes, suppose that AT&T is trying to order wholesale switching from MCI. This arrangement would be made possible through the following steps: First, MCI (or the "Host" in this scenario) would submit a Collocation Augment Application to BellSouth, pursuant to its interconnection agreement, and a LOA for the new entity, AT&T (the "Guest" in this scenario). With a Guest/Host arrangement, if the Collocation Augment Application requests that MCI's existing CFAs be converted to the new ACTL for AT&T, then BellSouth will perform the work to make the necessary changes in BellSouth's cable and pair assignments and update its facility assignment databases. As soon as BellSouth has completed the migration of these CFAs to reflect the re-assignment of these CFAs to AT&T, MCI will be notified that BellSouth can accept orders directly from AT&T. If the Collocation Augment Application submitted by MCI requests that new CFA facilities be provisioned under AT&T's ACTL, then BellSouth will perform the work necessary to complete the assignment of the new CFAs and will then accept orders directly from AT&T using these new CFAs.

Q. AT THE TOP OF PAGE 58, MR. VAN DE WATER STATES THAT "IF
UNBUNDLED LOCAL SWITCHING IS NO LONGER AVAILABLE TO
COMPETITORS, ALL COMPETITORS WILL HAVE TO INSTALL THEIR OWN
FACILITIES IN COLLOCATION SPACE." IS THIS TRUE?

Α.

It depends. If a CLEC already has sufficient collocation space in the central offices that serve its mass market customers, then there would be no need for the CLEC to augment its existing space. However, if the CLEC does not have collocation space in a particular central office or does not have sufficient space in a particular central office to serve its mass market customers, then the CLEC must request a new collocation arrangement, augment an existing collocation arrangement or use EELs to reach these customers.

In those instances in which a CLEC does not currently have the necessary collocated facilities and network equipment in place to support the migration of its embedded base of UNE-P mass market customers, the CLEC may request new or additional collocation space for the placement of its network equipment to achieve the migration of its UNE-P customers over to UNE-L service. Pursuant to this request, BellSouth would complete any such request for collocation space within the Commission-ordered provisioning intervals (which are dependent upon the type of collocation space requested – i.e., virtual, caged or cageless) or pay substantial penalties for missing these intervals. As soon as BellSouth receives an order for collocation space from a CLEC, BellSouth begins preparing the space to meet the particular specifications requested by the CLEC. In addition,

1		the CLEC can request permission to occupy the requested space prior to
2		BellSouth's completion of the space provisioning.
3		
4	Q.	IS THERE ANY OTHER TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT, BESIDES COLLOCATION
5		THAT CAN BE USED BY A CLEC TO REACH ITS CUSTOMERS IF
6		UNBUNDLED LOCAL SWITCHING IS ELIMINATED?
7		
8	A.	Yes. As I stated above, a CLEC may also order EELs from its end user at the
9		DS0 level (which may or may not terminate into the CLEC's collocation space) to
10		its switch, POP or other designated location as a means of converting its
11		embedded UNE-P customer base to UNE-L service. The DS0 transport piece of
12		the EEL may terminate to the CLEC's collocation space or it may terminate
13		directly at the CLEC's POP.
14		
15	Q.	MR. VAN DE WATER IMPLIES THAT BELLSOUTH MAY NOT BE ABLE TO
16		ACCOMMODATE A "DRAMATIC" INCREASE IN COLLOCATION SPACE IF
17		UNBUNDLED LOCAL SWITCHING IS NO LONGER AVAILABLE TO CLECS?
18		PLEASE COMMENT.
19		
20	A.	Mr. Van de Water's testimony on this point is nothing more than speculation. Mr.
21		Van de Water cites no facts to support his suggestion that BellSouth is not
22		equipped to handle the processing of the increased collocation applications it
23		might receive in the future. Furthermore, Mr. Van de Water fails to consider that
24		if the number of collocation applications received by BellSouth significantly
25		increases, so that there becomes a need for BellSouth to increase its current

staffing levels, BellSouth is prepared to do so. Also, BellSouth is continually analyzing and updating its electronic ordering system, called the e.App system, for the processing of collocation applications to ensure that BellSouth uses the most efficient means of processing all requested applications for collocation space.

Q. MR. VAN DE WATER SPECULATES THAT "THE INTERVAL TO OBTAIN AND BUILD OUT COLLOCATION SPACE LIKELY WILL INCREASE." DO YOU AGREE?

Α.

Absolutely not. As demonstrated in BellSouth witness Al Varner's testimony, BellSouth's current performance clearly shows that BellSouth is extremely committed to providing carriers with collocation space in its central offices as quickly as possible and in accordance with the provisioning intervals ordered by this Commission. Mr. Van de Water implies that this will change if BellSouth experiences an increase in the number of collocation applications it receives, which Mr. Van de Water is assuming will be significantly greater than the number of current applications being processed by BellSouth today. Mr. Van de Water neglects to mention, however, that if BellSouth fails to meet the performance standards ordered by this Commission, BellSouth must pay SEEMs penalties to those CLECs that are directly affected by BellSouth's inability to complete the CLECs' collocation arrangements within the required provisioning intervals. Consequently, BellSouth has no incentive to delay the provisioning of a CLEC's requested collocation space and every incentive to continue to provision space on a timely basis.

1		
2	Q.	FINALLY, ON PAGE 58, MR. VAN DE WATER SUGGESTS THAT SUFFICIENT
3		COLLOCATION SPACE MAY NOT BE AVAILABLE IN SMALL, REMOTE
4		CENTRAL OFFICES. DO YOU AGREE?
5		
6	A.	No. In fact, typically it is the smaller, rural (which is what I believe Mr. Van de
7		Water is referring to by his reference to "remote") central offices that have more
8		collocation space available than many of the larger offices. It has been
9		BellSouth's experience that frequently it is the larger central offices or those
10		central offices that are located in densely populated, metropolitan areas that are
11		the most likely to reach space exhaust. This is likely due to the fact that these
12		larger offices typically house a BellSouth tandem switch or serve a large
13		customer base in a densely populated and/or fast-growing area.
14		
15	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?
16		

18

A.

Yes.